

RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW
FRISCO BUILDING
502 WEST SIXTH STREET
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74119-1010
(918) 587-3161
Fax (918) 587-9708

GREGORY W. ALBERTY
REBECCA V. AMENT
JACK R. ANDERSON
THOMAS M. ASKEW
RYAN J. ASSINK
VADEN F. BALES
LISA K. BICKLE
DONALD M. BINGHAM
WILLIAM A. BOWLES
PETER W. BRODLICK
SCOTT W. BYRD
JILL L. CHASE
DERRICK D. CORNEJO
STEPHEN L. CORTES
DONNA MARIE DE SIMONE
ROBERT F. DEAN
EDWARD D. DILLON
JANET S. DUMONT
IRA L. EDWARDS, JR.
GEORGE M. EMERSON
STEPHANIE A. FLING
RICHARD A. GANN
BART T. GARBUTT
RICHARD T. GARREN
D. SHARON GENTRY
PATRICK H. GREEN
STEPHEN E. HALE
MELVIN C. HALL

SHARON E. HAMM
ZACHERY R. HARGIS
JERRI L. HILL
HOLLY M. HILLERMAN
ERIK S. HOUGHTON
ROBERT E. HOWARD
VAUGHN ISKANIAN
WM. GREGORY JAMES
STEVEN JANSZEWSKI
DEBORAH L. JOHNSTONE
KIEMONN L. JONES
MARTYE M. KENDRICK
SARAH G. KIENY
SCOTT P. KIRTLEY
KRISTOPHER E. KOEPEL
TERRY D. KORDELSKI, II
G. DIANE LEE
JOSEPH P. LENNART
TYLER D. LEONARD
C. S. LEWIS, III
MARY JEAN LITTLE
CARA Z. LOHMEYER
LORI T. LOVOI-NIEVES
JOHN D. LUTON
JANET G. MALLOW
JOHN ROSS MALLOY
MATT D. MATHESON
RAYMOND A. MELTON

J. PATRICK MENSCHING, JR.
RICHARD A. MILDREN
J. LYON MOREHEAD
ROBERT A. NANCE
GARY L. NEAL
MARK L. NELMS
MARGARET A. NUNNERY
TIMOTHY A. O'KEEFE
JAMES C. ORBISON
JYOTI PANDYA
GEOFFREY L. PEARSON
CHERYL A. PETERSON
JAMES R. POLAN
RICHARD P. POORMON
VICTORIA L. RACKLEY
FRED RAHAL, JR.
LISA R. RIGGS
M. DAVID RIGGS
STEPHEN B. RILEY
RANDALL A. RINQUEST
MARY J. ROUNDS
JOHN E. SCIPIONE
WILLIAM C. SEARCY
KRISTEN E. SHILLINGTON
ROBERT P. SKEITH
KENNETH M. SMITH
SCOTT D. SMITH
BETTY J. SOMMARS
KIMBERLY V. SPARKS

BEVERLY A. STEWART
STEPHANIE L. THEBAN
DAVID H. THOMAS
HARLEY W. THOMAS
REX W. THOMPSON
CHERYL A. TOMAN
SONJAM. TREI
MICHAEL G. TURPEN
LINTA VAN ARREL-GREUBEL
KAREN CARDEN WALSH
SHARON K. WEAVER
JOSEPH R. WELLS
BRIAN S. WILKERSON
LUCAS A. WIRTH
JERRY L. WITT
COURTNEY M. WOLIN
MICHAEL P. WOMACK
GARY W. WOOD
TRACY S. ZAHL

Cf Counsel
Benjamin P. Abney
E. Bryan Henson
David P. Page
Peter J. Regan

June 18, 2008

Via Email: jjorgensen@sidley.com

Jay T. Jorgensen, Esq.
Sidley Austin, LLP
1501 K St. NW
Washington D.C. 20005

Re: Tyson Request for Production of Documents Concerning
Modeling Documents ("Modeling RFPs")

Dear Jay,

This letter is written in response to your recent email of June 17, 2008 (copy attached). There are several errors in your email that need correction.

First, the model – related materials produced by the State did and do comply with the State's discovery obligations under FRCP 26(a)(2) (expert reports) and 34(b)(2) (responses to request for production). I do not understand what you mean when you say the State did not comply with its "discovery obligations because they are not in a form that is reasonably useable." As I hope I made clear in my letter of June 13, 2008 to Michael Bond, the information that was produced to Defendants as part of Drs. Engel and Wells considered materials: (1) included the "documents" (computer files) that were requested by Tyson in the Tyson RFP; (2) were not "diagggregated" (as you claim in the Motion to Compel) and (3) were produced in the same form as they are maintained and used by Drs. Engel and Wells on their computers.

You are also incorrect in implying that our discussions on these topics were complete (so that your obligation to meet and confer was satisfied) and your claim that I "refused" to produce the models in the same format as they are maintained by Drs. Engel and Wells. My recollection of our discussions is that I told you that we were still preparing a detailed, supplemental response to the Model RFPs that would specifically identify which files produced in the Expert's considered materials responded to each

June 18, 2008

Page 2

particular request for production. I also recall telling you that I did not know whether or not we had produced or could feasibly produce the materials as they exist on each of the Expert's computers. But, I don't recall any "refusal" – only that I was still looking into the issue. As it turned out, and as I explained in my letter of June 13, 2008 (first paragraph) and again here, the State did produce the models in Drs. Engel and Wells considered materials as they were kept on their respective computers. What's more, you also have a detailed explanation of the modeling files that were produced that matches the produced files with the individual requests for production. Obviously your Motion to Compel was premature (and, indeed unwarranted). If you had simply allowed me to complete my work responding to your questions you would have seen that all of the information had been properly produced pursuant to FRCP 26 and 34 as part of the Engel and Wells considered materials and that the State's supplemental Response (June 13, 2008 letter to M. Bond) clearly identified which files responded to each individual request for production.

I believe the State has no obligation under Rules 26 or 34 to answer your new questions about Dr. Wells' expert analysis that you pose in yesterday's email. These questions would typically be posed to Dr. Wells in a deposition. However, in the spirit of continued cooperation I have endeavored to secure answers to these additional questions as follows:

Question No. 1

What were the different computers (manufacturer, model number, CPU type and operating system) used by Dr. Wells for the calibration and scenario runs described in his expert report?

Answer No. 1

Dell laptops, one Core Duo 2.2 GHz and one Core2 Duo 2.4 GHz; one desktop Intel core2 duo e7000; Windows XP Pro.

Question No. 2

What were the FORTRAM (sic) compiler options used by Dr. Wells to create the executables for these calibration and scenario runs?

Answer No. 2

Calibration runs:

```
/nologo/O3/Og/Qparallel/include:"C:\Program files\AnCAD\MATFOR4\include\if9"  
/real_size:64 /module:"Release\" /object:"Release\" /libs:static /threads /winapp /c
```

June 18, 2008

Page 3

/OUT:"Release\w2_ivf.exe" /NOLOGO /LIBPATH:"C:\Program Files\AnCAD\MATFOR4\lib\if9" /MANIFEST /MANIFESTFILE:"C:\scott\research\corps of engineers\tomcole\w2code\version 36\ivf\win32\w2_code\w2-intel\WinApp1\release\w2_ivf.exe.intermediate.manifest" /SUBSYSTEM:WINDOWS /IMPLIB:"C:\scott\research\corps of engineers\tomcole\w2code\version 36\ivf\win32\w2_code\w2-intel\WinApp1\release\w2_ivf.lib" fml.lib fgl.lib spml.lib

ALSO only for the following subroutines TEMPERATURE, TRANSPORT, WQCONSTITUENTS:

/nologo /O3 /Og /Qparallel /include:"C:\Program Files\AnCAD\MATFOR4\include\if9" /real_size:64 /module:"Release\\" /object:"Release\\" /libs:static /threads /winapp /c /Qopenmp

ALSO only for WATER QUALITY:

/nologo /Og /Qparallel /include:"C:\Program Files\AnCAD\MATFOR4\include\if9" /real_size:64 /module:"Release\\" /object:"Release\\" /libs:static /threads /winapp /c

Scenario runs:

/nologo /O3 /Og /Qparallel /real_size:64 /module:"Release\\" /object:"Release\\" /libs:static /threads /c

/OUT:"Release\fhab.exe" /INCREMENTAL:NO /NOLOGO /MANIFEST /MANIFESTFILE:"C:\scott\research\corps of engineers\tomcole\w2code\NEW code enhancements\fish habitat criterion\fhab\release\fhab.exe.intermediate.manifest" /SUBSYSTEM:CONSOLE /IMPLIB:"C:\scott\research\corps of engineers\tomcole\w2code\NEW code enhancements\fish habitat criterion\fhab\release\fhab.lib"

ALSO only for the following subroutines TEMPERATURE, TRANSPORT, WQCONSTITUENTS:

/nologo /O3 /Og /Qparallel /real_size:64 /module:"Release\\" /object:"Release\\" /libs:static /threads /c /Qopenmp

ALSO only for WATER QUALITY:

/nologo /Og /Qparallel /real_size:64 /module:"Release\\" /object:"Release\\" /libs:static /threads /c

June 18, 2008
Page 4

Question No. 3

Was the model executable currently on the Portland State University website: <http://www.cee.pdx.edu/w2> (for Version 3.6) the executable used for these calibration and scenario runs?

Answer No. 3

The model executable on the PSU website was used for the calibration runs. The executables for the scenario runs were included in the run directories for the scenario runs produced in the Wells' considered materials. The source code for the scenario runs was included in the file "source code.zip".

Question No. 4

There are multiple calibration run directories in the modeling documents produced. Which calibration run directory (e.g., Run 200, 201, 202, etc.) corresponds to the calibration results in Dr. Wells' expert report?

Answer No. 4

Run143 was the run used in the Wells' Expert Report.

I trust that this letter satisfactorily explains the situation and that you will immediately withdraw the Motion to Compel. I also suggest that we schedule the Engel and Wells depositions so that any other modeling questions may be expeditiously answered.

Very Truly Yours,



David P. Page

DPP/sdk

Enc.

June 18, 2008
Page 5

cc: Michael Bond (via email)

David Page

From: Jorgensen, Jay T. [jjorgensen@sidley.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 12:45 PM
To: Ward, Liza; David Page
Cc: Bond, Michael R.
Subject: RE: Following up on your call

Liza,

I have checked with the other defendants and they agree that the Motion to Compel is well founded. The model-related materials produced by the state do not comply with the plaintiffs' discovery obligations because they are not in a form that is reasonably usable. For that reason, we requested that plaintiffs produce exact copies of the models in the form they are maintained by plaintiffs. We have conferred with plaintiffs on this matter multiple times in an effort to obtain the information that the plaintiffs were required to previously produce. As only one example, during the week of June 2-6 I spoke with David Page on the phone about this several times and asked if plaintiffs would produce the models in the same format they are maintained by the plaintiffs' experts. He refused, stating that such a production is not (in his view) technically feasible because portions of the plaintiffs' models reside on three separate computers.

However, defendants always want to resolve issues without court intervention. It is possible that we will be able to overcome the obstacles created by plaintiffs' production if the plaintiffs provide additional information about your models and the way they are maintained. Would you be willing to answer the following questions? If so, I can commit that defendants will take this information to their experts in an attempt to resolve the uncertainties addressed in the Motion to Compel. If those uncertainties are resolved, we may be able to withdraw the motion:

1. What were the different computers (manufacturer, model number, CPU type and operating system) used by Dr. Wells for the calibration and scenario runs described in his expert report?
2. What were the FORTRAM compiler options used by Dr. Wells to create the executables for these calibration and scenario runs?
3. Was the model executable currently on the Portland State University website: <http://www.cce.pdx.edu/w2> (for Version 3.6) the executable used for these calibration and scenario runs?
4. There are multiple calibration run directories in the modeling documents produced. Which calibration run directory (e.g., Run 200, 201, 202, etc.) corresponds to the calibration results in Dr. Wells' expert report?

Jay

From: Ward, Liza [mailto:lward@motleyrice.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 12:02 PM
To: Jorgensen, Jay T.
Cc: Bond, Michael R.
Subject: RE: Following up on your call

Jay,

We still haven't heard anything from you regarding Defendants' position on the State's Motion to Strike. Unless I hear from you by 3 p.m. (Eastern), we will assume that the remaining Defendants share Tyson's position that they object to the relief sought by the State's Motion to Strike and will file the same.

Thanks.

Elizabeth "Liza" C. Ward | Attorney at Law | Motley Rice LLC
28 Bridgeside Blvd. | Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464 | lward@motleyrice.com
o. 843 216-9280 | c. 843 834 2514 | f. 843.216.9450

From: Jorgensen, Jay T. [mailto:jjorgensen@sidley.com]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2008 12:00 PM
To: Ward, Liza
Cc: Bond, Michael R.
Subject: Following up on your call

Liza,

Thanks for speaking with me this morning. To summarize our conversations, you asked whether defendants would be willing to withdraw their motion to compel production of working copies of plaintiffs' models. If not, plaintiffs intend to file a motion to strike. The grounds for the motion are that plaintiffs believe they are still meeting and conferring with defendants on this issue.

I told you I would pass this request on to the other defendants, since the motion was filed on behalf of all of them. I have passed on your

6/18/2008

request, and will let you know as soon as I have received a response from each of the defendants.

Jay

Jay T. Jorgensen | Sidley Austin LLP
1501 K St NW, Washington D.C. 20005 | 202.736.8020

Sidley Austin LLP mail server made the following annotations on 06/16/08, 11:00:24:

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To comply with certain U.S. Treasury regulations, we inform you that, unless expressly stated otherwise, any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication, including attachments, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding any penalties that may be imposed on such taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, if any such tax advice is used or referred to by other parties in promoting, marketing or recommending any partnership or other entity, investment plan or arrangement, then (i) the advice should be construed as written in connection with the promotion or marketing by others of the transaction(s) or matter(s) addressed in this communication and (ii) the taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify us immediately.

Confidential & Privileged

Unless otherwise indicated or obvious from its nature, the information contained in this communication is attorney-client privileged and confidential information/work product. This communication is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error or are not sure whether it is privileged, please immediately notify us by return e-mail and destroy any copies--electronic, paper or otherwise--which you may have of this communication.

Sidley Austin LLP mail server made the following annotations on 06/17/08, 12:44:40:

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To comply with certain U.S. Treasury regulations, we inform you that, unless expressly stated otherwise, any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication, including attachments, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding any penalties that may be imposed on such taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, if any such tax advice is used or referred to by other parties in promoting, marketing or recommending any partnership or other entity, investment plan or arrangement, then (i) the advice should be construed as written in connection with the promotion or marketing by others of the transaction(s) or matter(s) addressed in this communication and (ii) the taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify us immediately.

6/18/2008